

E3
72. (new) The tyre of claim 60, wherein the annular anchoring inserts each comprise a single series of radially-superposed concentric coils.

73. (new) The tyre of claim 60, wherein the at least one filling body radially extends from a respective annular anchoring insert, tapering away from the respective annular anchoring insert.

74. (new) The tyre of claim 60, wherein a ratio of a radial extension of the annular anchoring insert to a radial extension of the at least one filling body is greater than or equal to 0.5:1 and less than or equal to 2.5:1.

75. (new) The tyre of claim 60, wherein the at least one filling body comprises a hardness greater than or equal to 48° Shore D at 23°C and less than or equal to 55° Shore D at 23°C.--

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment, accompanied by an Appendix to Amendment, a Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.97(c), and a Petition for Extension of Time, in reply to the Office Action mailed January 16, 2003.

In this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 43-46 and 49-60 to better define the claimed invention and to improve clarity. Applicant also adds new claims 61-75.

Before entry of this Amendment, claims 43-60 were pending in this application. After entry of this Amendment, claims 43-75 are pending in this application.

The originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings fully support the amendments to claims 43-46 and 49-60 and the addition of new claims 61-75. No new matter was introduced.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 43-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1; rejected claims 43, 59, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,419,384 to Iseki ("Iseki") or U.S. Patent No. 3,826,297 to Alderfer ("Alderfer") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,632,836 to Verschoor et al. ("Verschoor"); rejected claims 43-49 and 56-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 3,240,250 to Frazier ("Frazier") in view of Verschoor; and rejected claims 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Frazier in view of Verschoor.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

Applicant notes that page 8, lines 12-13, of the specification recites "forming at least one filling body" (emphasis added). Applicant submits that at least this portion of the originally-filed specification, claims, abstract, and drawings provides support for the claim language "at least one filling body."

Applicant also amends claims 43, 59, and 60 to delete "over a portion of the at least one filling body." Accordingly, Applicant submits that this amendment resolves the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1, related to the recitation "over at least a portion of the at least one filling body."

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Independent Claims

Applicant submits that the amendments to claims 43, 59, and 60 reciting “a pair of annular reinforcing structures applied against end flaps of the strip sections of the first series and overlapped by end flaps of the strip sections of the at least one second series” resolve the Examiner’s rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Specifically, no proper combination of the cited references, including Alderfer, Frazier, Iseki, Verschoor, and the other art of record, teaches or suggests the present invention as claimed in independent claims 43, 59, or 60.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)—Dependent Claims

Applicant further submits that dependent claims 44-58 and 61-75 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited references, including Alderfer, Frazier, Iseki, Verschoor, and the other art of record. This is true whether such art is considered alone or in any proper combination, in particular, at least due to the dependency of claims 44-58, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 43, and the dependency of claims 61-75, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 60.

Other Claim Amendments

Applicant makes other claim amendments to improve clarity.

Claim Scope

In discussing the specification, claims, abstract, and drawings in this Amendment, it is to be understood that Applicant is in no way intending to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification or abstract and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicant believes that Applicant is entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Summary


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this Application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: July 15, 2003

By: 
Lawrence F. Galvin
Reg. No. 44,694

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com